DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 034 SP 010 594

TITLE Evaluation of State University Laboratory Schools.
INSTITUTION Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 76
NOTE 53p.; For related document, see SP 010 595
AVAILABLE FROM Commissioner Ralph D. Turlington, State of Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304 (No price quoted)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Development; *Educational Research; *Laboratory Schools; *Program Evaluation; State Departments of Education; State of the Art Reviews; *State Surveys; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

This report containing the evaluation of state university laboratory schools in Florida is part of a study of state coordination of research and development efforts for education in Florida. It includes: (1) recommendations from the 1969 study on laboratory schools by the State University System of Florida and a review of the current status of laboratory schools in Florida; (2) an introduction to the state of the art of laboratory schools on the national scene and in Florida; (3) a summary of criteria to be used in conducting a program review of laboratory schools, developed by the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, used in this evaluation; (4) findings and recommendations of the program review teams made in April and May 1976 during visits to the laboratory schools at the four host campuses; and (5) a summary of findings and concluding recommendations regarding laboratory schools in Florida. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131034

Evaluation of State University Laboratory Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner

october 1, 1976

SP010 594

Evaluation of State University

Laboratory Schools

Contents

	SUBJECT	PAGE
I	Recommendations from the 1969 Study on Laboratory Schools by the State University System of Florida, and a review of the current status of Laboratory Schools in Florida	1
II	An introduction to today's state of the art of Laboratory Schools on the national scene and in Florida	5
III	Summary of criteria to be used in conducting a program review of Laboratory Schools, developed by the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and employed in this evaluation	11
IV	Findings and recommendations of the program review teams made in April and May, 1976, during visits to the Laboratory Schools at the four host campuses	13
	A. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU)	13
	B. The Florida State University (FSU)	19
	C. University of Florida (UF)	30
	D. Florida Atlantic University (FAU)	39
V	A Summary of findings and concluding recommendations regarding Laboratory Schools in Florida	47

I. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 1969 STUDY ON LABORATORY SCHOOLS BY THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA, AND CURRENT STATUS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA

A. 1969 Recommendations

In December, 1969, the Office for Academic Affairs of Florida's State University System published a study entitled "Campus Laboratory Schools in the State University System in Florida." The study was extensive and responsive to questions raised in the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Florida Legislature, and to general controversy regarding the merits of campus laboratory schools. At that time, the main opposition to the retention of the Schools centered around four points: (1) they cost too much, (2) they primarily serve faculty children and children of the community elite, (3) their functions can be carried out as well or better in public schools, and (4) they lag behind in adopting innovative practices. The four supportive points were: (1) high risk experimentation is safer and more productive in a university setting, (2) school staff training to assist in research is best accomplished at a university, (3) resources for research are more available and adequate at a university, and (4) a university is more likely to attract outside funding for educational research.

The study concluded that the continuation of the campus laboratory schools could be justified only if their central mission became that of research and high risk experimentation, sharply focused in the search for solutions to persistent problems in teaching and learning.

There were seven implementation steps recommended by the study:

1. Continue the operation of each school.
2. Each school should receive basic financial support comparable to that received by public schools from local, state, and federal sources.
3. Support for research and experimentation should be provided over and above basic support.

4. The Commissioner of Education should designate the schools as R & D Centers to make them eligible for funds under provisions of the educational R & D Act.
5. Laboratory schools must develop productive and mutually beneficial relationships with county school systems.
6. The Department of Education is responsible for statewide dissemination of tested materials and practices.
7. Encourage use of schools by university researchers. . . faculty with grants should include 10 to 15 percent overhead to the laboratory schools.

Since 1969 all four schools have continued to operate. Host universities have received at least the basic financial support comparable to that received by public schools, under the Florida Educational Finance Program (FEFP) formula. Additional funds for research, service, summer school, and other special expenditures have been allocated to the host institutions to support research and experimentation. All four laboratory schools have been designated as centers for educational research. FSU and UF have developed clear mutually beneficial relationships with "county school systems." The Department of Education has not developed a statewide dissemination system for tested materials and practices. Faculty research grants do not include 10 to 15 percent overhead for laboratory schools.

B. Current Status

During early 1976 meetings of the Senate Ways and Means and Education Committees, questions were raised concerning continued funding of the four campus laboratory schools because of the apparent lack of efforts to coordinate and focus research and development on the educational priorities of the Florida public school system. However, funding was agreed upon by these committees for the 1976-77 school year, provided that the Department of Education would conduct a study, to include findings and recommendations, on the future disposition of the campus laboratory schools in Florida.

The 1976 Legislature provided for the operation of the four university laboratory schools for FY 1977, and this was expressed in proviso

language as follows:

> THE BOARD OF REGENTS, UPON APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, SHALL ALLOCATE NO LESS THAN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE BASE STUDENT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY THE LEGISLATURE IN THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM FOR THE 1976-77 SCHOOL YEAR AND THE TOTAL 1975-76 ESTIMATED LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNDING, TO THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM LABORATORY SCHOOLS FOR THE SUPPORT OF RESEARCH AND SERVICE PROJECTS WHICH ADDRESS THE STATE'S PRIORITY NEEDS IN INSTRUCTION AND OTHER PROGRAMS SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE STATE.

The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) total is $2,199,750.00 The 1975-76 estimated laboratory school funding total is $2,966,178.00, thus the "difference" referred to in the proviso amounts to $766,428.00 The amounts to each institution were calculated using the previous year's percentage of funding.

	1975-76 Estimated Lab School Funding	FEFP Total	"No Less Than" Amount-Research and Service
FSU	$ 1,164,327.00	$ 727,070.00	$ 437,257.00
FAMU	481,903.00	430,469.00	51,434.00
UF	984,059.00	749,355.00	234,704.00
FAU	335,889.00	292,856.00	43,033.00
	$ 2,966,178.00	$2,199,750.00	$ 766,428.00

"Goal Six" of the seven goals of education is published in the Education Element of the State Comprehensive Plan:

> Research and Development. The public education network shall seek solutions to local, regional, state, and national problems through organized research and development. Research and development shall be organized to solve pressing problems and to expand the store of knowledge in all areas of human endeavor, including education.

Using this as a point of departure, representatives of the Department of Education from the offices of the Commissioner, the Chancellor, and the Director of the Public School Division, met to discuss the priority needs of the public schools in light of potential contributions to meeting these needs by the four laboratory schools.

The outcome of the meeting was the listing of the following priority areas for research and service projects to be carried out by the university laboratory schools:

1. Studies which deal directly with diagnostic and prescriptive aspects of the basic skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing, and arithmetic)
2. Classroom management related to student discipline
3. Procedures to involve parents in school decision-making
4. Identification of teacher subject-matter competencies
5. In-service teacher training and education
6. Utilization of paraprofessionals
7. Meeting nondiscrimination obligations
8. Education of borderline, gifted, talented, or creative students
9. Application of technology or alternative management practices to reduce the cost of education by 20% or more over the next 5 to 10 years
10. The integration of severely handicapped students, e.g., deaf, blind, emotionally disturbed, into regular school campuses--to include pre-kindergarten children

University representatives from FAMU, FAU, FSU, and UF have transmitted descriptions of programs/activities which the institution, through the laboratory school, intends to undertake to assist in meeting the identified needs. These have been found to be consistent with needs listed in 1 through 10 above, and the Commissioner has approved the research and service projects to be conducted by the four laboratory schools for the school year 1976-77.

II. AN INTRODUCTION TO TODAY'S STATE OF THE ART OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS ON THE NATIONAL SCENE AND IN FLORIDA

Historically, the role of the laboratory school in the nation has been to assist in the training of new teachers and the demonstration of exemplary teaching techniques. Today this role is changing. Many laboratory schools are becoming centers for educational research and are serving as laboratories for the testing of education theory, and solving problems associated with public education from pre-school through 12th grade. However, the necessity for a third role is becoming increasingly apparent. The laboratory school must also serve as a translator between theory and reality.

Today, laboratory schools must play an important role in the public school system if they are to receive continued public support. Dr. Robert Hearn, President of the National Association of Laboratory Schools, states that laboratory schools which (1) undertake relevant research projects and (2) disseminate the results of these projects to area public schools, have a greater chance of survival.

Dr. Madeline Hunter, Principal of the University of California at Los Angeles Laboratory School, expands the role of her laboratory school to include meeting with teachers, staff, and administrators in all environments. She believes that laboratory schools will continue to function within society if they perform research on important questions that relate to public education. She believes that the results must be disseminated to all environments -- rural, out-of-state, regional, city, and local. The results must have application to instruction and learning, according to Dr. Hunter.

Other areas that would fall within the realm of the role of laboratory schools include the following:

1. Workshops, in-service staff development programs, and various levels of consultation with community public schools;
2. Curricula, facilities, and programs that address the exceptional child;

3. Free source of experimentation and data for graduate students working on theses and dissertations;
4. Observation clinic for undergraduate and graduate students learning to become teachers;
5. Research projects by scholars outside the college of education;
6. Special projects requested by county school district personnel who do not have the facility, funding, sampling group, and/or personnel to conduct such a project;
7. A supplement to interning and teacher practicum;
8. A facility for special and creative summer school programs sponsored by a community organization or a department in the university;
9. An alternative school;
10. Using high school students to teach in the elementary schools.

In a contact with Ellis Wiley, Principal of the Georgia Southern Laboratory School and President of the Southeastern Association of Laboratory Schools, it was related that laboratory schools are closed down for three reasons:

1. Cost of operating schools is prohibitive. Many institutions find that money is spent more profitably in other ways to provide teacher education -- such as contracts with public school systems.
2. Research value is questionable when considering the structure of the student population of the lab school as opposed to the general population.
3. Problems exist in getting and keeping teachers and administrators willing to work "in a gold fish bowl" environment.

President Wiley cites two key requirements for a laboratory school to remain viable:

1. The high calibre and commitment of some lab school personnel is a key factor in the continued operation of succcessful schools.

2. Cooperation between the lab school, the public school districts, and the supporting college of a university in terms of commitment and mission, are necessary.

Although laboratory schools are changing their roles to include relevant research, dissemination of results to local public schools, sponsoring workshops and staff development projects, and developing curricula for the exceptional child, many of the laboratory schools are closing down. This can be seen in the trend chart supplied by Dr. Ed Vertuno, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Association of Laboratory Schools:

Year	Total Schools
69-70	195
70-71	197
71-72	183
72-73	179
73-74	177
74-75	170
75-76	166

Authorities on laboratory schools cite the primary reason to be fiscal. The cost of maintaining operations of the laboratory schools is becoming prohibitive due to a lack of return on the investment, the ability to conduct the mission in the public sector, and a lack of results which are generalizable to other school settings.

Dr. Edward Bass, former Director of the Florida State University Laboratory School and former President of the National Association of Laboratory Schools, states the disjuncture in the mission of the laboratory school and the mission of the parent college or university, to be another reason why they are closing down operations. For example, a laboratory school whose administration views its purposes as teacher training will find survival difficult in an institution whose college of education is research oriented.

A laboratory school's mission, according to Dr. Hunter, must

include its becoming a center for inquiry, an essential component of the education design to produce new theory, translation of theory into generalizable practice, and dissemination of knowledge and practice into the mainstream of America's education.

This role of the laboratory schools will only be successfully accomplished if an evaluation and statement of the laboratory school's missions are actively pursued. Dr. Frederick Cyphert, Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University, was instrumental several years ago in closing down the Ohio State laboratory school. He offers several significant considerations:

1. The location of the laboratory school and the access to public schools by university experimenters are important in deciding if a college should operate a laboratory school.
2. If a laboratory school is accomplishing its objectives, we must still ask if that is the best way to accomplish these objectives.
3. It must be made clear exactly what the lab school wants to do or what is expected of it, then we should look at alternative ways to get to where the school wants to go, and if it is the best way to meet the objectives, it may well be justified.

In Florida, the four existing state operated laboratory schools function under a mission statement set forth in the 1969 report issued by the Office for Academic Affairs of Florida's State University System. The statement is as follows:

> The central mission of the laboratory schools in Florida will be that of research and high risk experimentation, while investigations will sharply focus in search of solutions to persistent problems in teaching and learning.

The results of a 1975 national survey conducted by the Southeastern Association of Laboratory Schools in Statesboro, Georgia (Georgia Southern College), found P.K. Yonge School at UF to be the school which "most nearly conforms to the image of the ideal laboratory school of the future." Sixty schools were named by 250 administrators from laboratory

schools; P.K. Yonge was named 23 times, a California school 17 times, an Iowa school 11 times, a Minnesota school 7 times, an Indiana school 6 times, FSU's Developmental Research School 4 times, with 6 others, and the remaining 48 in descending order. The Henderson School at Florida Atlantic University was mentioned twice, and the school at FAMU was not mentioned. Thus, P.K. Yonge administration sees their school as the top 1975 lab school in Florida and the nation.

In April and May of 1976, Florida's State University System sent out teams to evaluate the four campus laboratory schools. The findings and recommendations may be found in Chapter IV. It is significant to point out here that the administrators of each school professed to being engaged in educational research, and the general state of the art for each laboratory school was seen as follows:

1. The laboratory school at FAMU is not currently conducting significant high-risk experiments but the facilities at FAMU are adequate to conduct this type of research, and the faculty is capable of performing experimental functions.
2. The laboratory school at FSU is engaged in 60 projects in such areas as curriculum development, counselor education, learning theory, teacher education, instrument development and instructional development and strategies; they disseminate research findings through in-house publications and at professional meetings and workshops.
3. The laboratory school at UF has recently produced 38 research and development projects that have dealt with curriculum, dissemination, learning, and methodology. The school disseminates research findings by way of staff authorized monographs, conferences, workshops and in-service projects.
4. The laboratory school at FAU is currently involved in one research project but has not been conducting dissemination activities with local public or private schools. The laboratory school at FAU desires to change its experimental mission to that of a center for the gifted child.

It has become clear that the states of the art of the laboratory schools in Florida are diverse to the extent that one mission for all is no longer appropriate, and mission statements for each must be developed, clarified, and justified. In situations where this is not possible, there would be little justification for the expenditure of public funds to keep a school open, and the alternative would be to close the school and redistribute the pupils and teachers back to the local school districts.

III. SUMMARY OF CRITERIA TO BE USED IN CONDUCTING A PROGRAM REVIEW OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS DEVELOPED BY THE OFFICE OF VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND EMPLOYED IN THIS EVALUATION

In conjuction with the on-site program reviews of each college of education at the nine state universities conducted in April and May, 1976, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs developed a set of criteria for review teams to use as a reference when visiting the four laboratory schools. These criteria were used jointly as points of departure by the teams and the laboratory school staffs. Each school had received a set in advance of the visits, and staffs were prepared to respond to the questions. The criteria are also employed in this evaluation.

The two points of emphasis dealt with the unique role of each school and the adequacy of the budget to meet current and future reseach needs.

Unique Role

1. Purpose, goals, missions, programs
2. Program development: decisions, evaluation, coordination, overlap, duplication
3. Research: what kind, how articulated, problems associated, use of human subjects, student retention, parent reactions, supervision, plant adequacy, dissemination efforts, how accomplished, to whom, participation in regional/state/national conferences, meaningfulness of product
4. Professional relationships with college and university staffs; articulation with county schools' staffs
5. Professional services to county schools: methods of choosing students, benefits to county students, role of school staff to county staff, response to requests for workshops, demonstrations, in-service training, seminars, materials, and training in use of equipment/materials; assistance to parents, counseling, meeting pupil needs; services to county planners and administrators; new classroom techniques, teacher education; student participation in research

Adequacy of the Budget

1. Affect on the unique role by drastic budget reduction and sharp reduction of faculty and students; possibility of concentration on only one phase of education; other means of reducing costs and numbers and still maintain integrity of school role
2. College faculty status of laboratory school personnel, and other policies dealing with tenure, promotion, etc; faculty participation on college/university committees; university faculty participation on school committees
3. Laboratory school costs, comparison with local county school budgets, use of physical plant, monies available for keeping up with inflation, new program development; new staff, etc.
4. Local justifications and explanations of the worth of the unique role of the school and why it should be retained; consequences of eliminating the funding for laboratory school(s).

IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAMS MADE IN APRIL AND MAY, 1976, DURING VISITS TO THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS AT THE FOUR HOST CAMPUSES

At each school, volumes of paperwork were made available to the review teams, most of which responded in great length to the criteria, represented examples of research products, and in several cases were working files tabbed as references. The following has been developed after making the visits, reading the materials, discussing their contents with the laboratory school staffs, and conferring with other review team members.

A. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU)

Florida A & M University High School

The review was conducted on April 12-13, 1976, by:

Dr. Norman Lyon - Team Leader, Lay Consultant from Palm Harbor, Florida

Dr. Billy Hauserman - Associate Dean, Department of Education, Towson State College, Maryland

Mr. Tom Furlong - Associate for Program Policy Analysis, Florida Department of Education

The team interviewed Mr. Matthew H. Estaras, School Director; Dr. Milagros Ingnatz, Research Coordinator; and eleven of the teachers employed at the school. The University High School enrolled 495 students in the 1975-76 school year; 120 K-3, 220 4-9, and 155 10-12. Annual pupil tuition was $6.00 a year for elementary students and $10.00 a year for middle and high school students. This represented the most affordable tuition, being half that charged by UF for high school, less than a quarter charged by FSU, and an eleventh of the FAU fee.

Unique Role

1. Goals, missions, programs - FAMU is a school for pupils K-12, with an added obligation to conduct research and

and perform studies in evaluation and curriculum development. There were two projects underway, one in communication skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening); the pilot portion of the reading section has been completed. Also, a model science program has been readied for testing.

2. Research - With the small amount of funds available since 1969 the amount of research produced was more than should be expected. In that year (1969) laboratory school staffs were charged by the Board of Regents to place strong emphasis on "high risk" research with adequate funds to be provided. During 1975-76, the funds for research reportedly amounted to about $1,000.00. There was a good nucleus of personnel at the Laboratory School to carry on a satisfactory research program if adequate funds become available. The review team concluded that the FAMU Laboratory School has the potential to be an excellent center for the investigation of "high risk" types of research that might not be possible or practical in a public school, but the school was not functioning at its full potential.
3. Relationships - There was a formal relationship between the Laboratory School and the University in that the School was considered a functioning part of the College of Education. The staff attended general faculty meetings and participated on committees. However, there was no structural relationship between the School and the public schools in the district.
4. Services - There was a lack of demonstrations of unique teaching procedures for visiting teachers, conferences and workshops either at the School or in the district schools. The School was not serving as a center for development of materials and/or curriculum.

The team found a warm, friendly atmosphere at the School with a strong dedication to the teaching profession on the part of

the teachers, principal, and other professional personnel. The same could be said about the students who were in the teacher education program. Everyone, without exception, evidenced complete cooperation with the review team.

There was no mechanism for disseminating information for program development, curriculum and materials were not available for use by county staffs, the professional staff did not serve a role to the county school staff, and there was no clinical testing, consultation, or special education. Students were not brought in from other schools, nor was assistance provided for county children.

5. Teacher Education - The Laboratory School has had a long tradition of support and service for the teacher education support at FAMU, especially in the observation and participation phases. This important part of the program was curtailed somewhat by the size of the classrooms and the limited enrollment K-12. Public schools near the Laboratory School were being used to augment the facilities at the University.

Adequacy of Budget

1. Drastic Budget Cut - The school administration at FAMU reported that a budget cut of any substance would "markedly reduce" research project plans, the teacher education function, and force an alteration in program offerings for the students.

2. Faculty Status - Although school staff members were able to serve on college committees, teachers could not receive college faculty status. However, if a professor taught for the school, he or she could hold a joint appointment.

3. Budget - The review team received only sketchy budgetary and fiscal data, but were shown that teacher salaries have not kept pace with those in county schools over the past three years. In addition, concern was expressed for the loss of research or project-support funds to the university. This reportedly

happens when funds are used by the School to develop a project, and the following year the project is expected to continue without funding. In general, the review team concluded that the State is getting a good return on its investment in the University School at FAMU. Not only were the children getting a quality education at a similar or lower cost than the public schools, but, in addition, the School offered necessary services for the preparation of teachers. A primary concern of the team was the lack of dollars for new development or growth.

In addition to FEFP funding to operate the school as an educational unit, the following represents a budgetary plan to expend some added funds for research and service activities during 1976-77:

Salaries		
Research Coordinator	$ 14,850	
Substitute Teachers	6,480	
Consultant Fees	1,500	
Teacher Aids	13,500	
		$ 36,330
Other		
Staff Travel	500	
Consultant Travel	1,000	
Supplies and Materials	5,000	
Telephone and Postage	50	
Reproduction	300	
Publications	238	
		7,088
TOTAL		$ 43,418

4. Justification - The main justification for retaining the FAMU Laboratory School, as presented by the school administration, was the retention of the teacher education/training

capability, to include participation and observation. The second reason for retention was to maintain and expand the research and experimentation potential, to include the pupil-subjects. Thirdly, a concern was expressed for the consequences of placing the pupils into the district's public schools, which might cause problems dealing with zoning, inter-racial balance, budgets, space, facilities, and equipment. The FAMU Laboratory School staff appeared anxious to get the chance to be more productive, and expressed an interest in seeing the State control and monitor directions that public education could take in the future -- through using laboratory schools such as FAMU as "vanguards for change."

Review Team Recommendations As Related to FAMU

1. There should be a program for physcially and mentally handicapped children, to include professional assistance to their parents and an opportunity for prospective teachers to have the experience of teaching these types of children.
2. Attempts should be made to procure additional research funds to augment state university funds.
3. The personnel at the school should be given more freedom from the classroom situation in order to carry on research projects, develop materials, and to make presentations and other in-service activities at public schools.
4. Racial balance could and should be improved, and efforts are being made to improve the imbalance of Black (85%) pupils over Whites.
5. Problems associated with classroom size might be improved through the use of electronic equipment such as closed circuit T.V.
6. The school could play a stronger role in the development of model programs.

7. The Elementary School wing should be rehabilitated with at least one area to facilitate the development of open classroom and/or modular teaching.
8. Strengthen the library holdings.

B. Florida State University (FSU)

Developmental Research School of FSU

The review was conducted on April 13-15, 1976, by:

Dr. Norman Lyon - Team Leader, Lay Consultant from Palm Harbor, Florida

Dr. Billy Hauserman, Associate Dean, Department of Education, Towson State College, Maryland

Dr. Jack Tebo - Associate for Policy Analysis, Florida Department of Education

Key personnel from the school were interviewed, to include Dr. Edward Vertuno, Director; Dr. Ernest Brown, Principal; Dr. Janice Smith, Research Coordinator; Dr. John McConnaughy, Assistant Principal; and 16 teachers. The Developmental Research School (DRS) enrolled 858 students in the 1975-76 school year; 16 pre-kindergarten, 174 K-3, 403 4-9, and 265 10-12. The DRS has been successful in attaining a balance similar to the State population, with the exception of those with Spanish surnames:

Percentage	Indian	Black	Asian	Spanish	Other	Total
State, 74-75	.18	22.47	.29	6.39	70.67	100
DRS, 74-75	.22	21.29	.68	.45	77.36	100

The annual pupil tuition is $45 per year, K-12.

Unique Role

1. Goals, missions, programs - The DRS at FSU has developed and instituted the goals and mission articulated in 1969 by the State University System study on laboratory schools. In addition to providing an excellent education to pupils K-12, plus pre-school students, the staff was dedicated to research, workshops, studies, and experimentation which deal with the priority needs of public schools. The mission addressed the

instructor, the subject matter, and the instruction methods. It was clearly evident to the review team that research and high risk experimentation were being conducted, and that efforts were being made to focus investigations on solutions to persistent problems in teaching and learning.

2. Research - The DRS faculty was expected to initiate and develop research projects as well as function in teaching capacities. For the first nine months of FY 1976 the DRS conducted 23 projects in curriculum development, plus 8 in instructional methods and strategies, 12 in counselor education, 4 in learning, 3 in teacher education, and 9 in instrument development.

   Since 1972, their R & D activities initiated were reported as follows:

Educational Area	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76 (April, 1976)
Curriculum Development	28	15	11	23
Instruction Methods	39	17	19	8
Counselor Education	16	8	15	12
Learning Theory	24	22	17	4
Teacher Education	5	5	3	3
Instrument Development	10	8	5	9
Surveys		3	5	0
Other			3	1
TOTAL	122	78	78	60

Dissemination of the research findings of projects conducted at the DRS is handled through two in-house publications, Unisearch and Idealab, and through the preparation of monographs. Articles are published in the professional journals, papers are presented at professional meetings, and a variety of workshops, consultations, and visitations are conducted each year. Their researchers also report their findings in the Journal of the National Association of Laboratory Schools.

3. Relationships - The staff maintains close professional relationships with the College of Education through membership on the college's research committee, which meets at least monthly. In addition the staff and teachers were being used by the University to teach FSU courses to college students at no added stipend. This service was a part of the hiring contract. As of April, 1976, the DRS had taught 27 courses for the University, either between their school classes or at night.

   The relationships with the public school districts were active, and projects with local and multiple counties around the state were in evidence throughout the school year. There was a clear communication arrangement with public school staffs in the Department of Education and the local districts to identify priority needs to address in their experimentation efforts.

4. Services - The faculty of the Developmental Research School has conducted workshops, made presentations, and served as consultants concerning their project findings. The numbers and kinds of dissemination activities related to DRS curricular programs, and research outcomes for the last four years, are presented in the following table:

September 1972 - April 1976

Year	Work-shops	Presen-tations	Responses to Requests	Visita-tion to DRS	Consult-ing	Met with Planners	Leader-ship in Associa-tions to July, 1975	Responded to Commun-ity Re-quests
1972-1973	17	57	61	5	34	0	13	4
1973-1974	8	56	59	5	29	1	9	5
1974-1975	25	34	23	19	21	4	21	4
1975-1976*	23	40	56	16	17	0	4	0
TOTAL	73	187	199	45	101	5	47	13

*September 1975-April 1976

These data are single instances which represent services provided on a one-to-one basis as well as those involving twenty-five people or more. The workshops varied in length from two hours to three weeks, and in one case, to eight weeks, with a daily schedule of eight hours. The participants represented classroom teachers, administrators, and supervisors.

Services were provided for personnel in various capacities. They ranged from classroom teachers to state departments of education, from civic organizations to curriculum planners and from community colleges to universities, both private and

public. Private schools, laboratory schools as well as public schools located throughout the United States have received services.

Most of the secondary discipline areas have been provided coverage with special mention of mathematics, science and music. In addition, copies of the elementary school Career Education project have been extensively disseminated throughout Florida in response to requests and workshops.

Another area of impact upon school curriculum and materials is that of published textbooks, articles, and compositions. A series of secondary mathematics books has been co-authored and recently revised by a member of the DRS faculty. A state-adopted Florida studies textbook and its accompanying workbook for elementary students were co-authored by two DRS teachers. A series of non-textbook reading and graphic materials on Florida studies for elementary pupils and another for secondary students have been co-authored by a faculty member. An individualized instructional junior high mathematics program has been copyrighted and is in use in five Florida counties. Numerous compositions for band and orchestra have been performed, recorded and are available for sale from music companies of national reputation. Learning packets which are an integral part of the music program have been developed and are now being pilot tested. Other projects such as art exhibits have been executed by members of the faculty. In addition to the above, articles written by the DRS faculty have appeared in state and national professional journals and magazines.

5. Teacher Education - Although teacher education has not been the thrust of the DRS for several years, faculty members continue to be active in the education of university students. Data collected from September 1975 to April 1976 show the involvement

of faculty members in this function.

University students observe teachers and DRS classes as a means of accomplishing a broad range of objectives. During the selected months of this academic year, 272 students observed and 117 students have participated in micro teaching which differs in nature from the regular classroom participation. The 12 students serving their internships there were honor students who conducted research projects in addition to their teaching responsibilities. The DRS faculty also had contact with 588 university students through the 27 FSU courses they taught. In addition to their assigned courses, 203 presentations were made by DRS faculty to other university classes.

Adequacy of Budget

1. Drastic Budget Cut - Just prior to the review team visit to FSU's DRS, Dr. Vertuno, the School's Director, testified to the Senate Education Committee that reduction of funding for the DRS to the FEFP level would be "cutting us off at our knees." This statement is quantified in terms of salaries for individuals over and above FEFP levels, who are now working directly on research and service projects which deal with major state priority needs in education:

a. Math skills - 10 teachers, 2/5 time	$ 54,622
b. Developmental reading - 3 teachers, 2/5 time; 4 teachers 1/5 time	23,953
c. Remedial reading - 1 reading specialist, 2/5 time; 4 teachers, 1/5 time	25,331
d. Disruptive students - 25 teachers, 1/5 time; counselor and 2 teachers, 2/5 time	90,264
e. Parent program - 1 teacher, 1/6 time	1,847
f. Micro-teaching - 1 teacher, 1/5 time	4,102

g.	Teacher in-service and dissemination - 1/8 of faculty, 2/5 time; photographer and media specialist	$ 97,001
h.	Hearing and non-hearing - 1 teacher, 1/2 time; 1 nurse, 1/5 time	9,132
i.	Research coordinator - 3/4 time	13,575
j.	Benefits (13.89%)	44,424
	Total	$ 364,251

2. Faculty status - Since 1972, when the School was a "department" of the College of Education, the DRS has been under the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Research. There was expressed to the review team some concern by the DRS staff that there is a distance in working relationships with the College of Education. The school was allowed to operate independently, and was seen by several of the DRS staff as a "spare tire" to the college and the university.

   DRS faculty had the option of seeking either a courtesy or a joint appointment in a related university academic program. There existed a tenure or permanent status system within the school, which may be attained after three continuous years and a reappointment for the fourth year.

   The faculty enjoyed a 12-month contract policy, and was allowed full participation in all employment benefits for which the member's classification is eligible at FSU and within the state government.

3. Budget - Part 1 of this section carries a partial breakdown of expenditures for research and service activities over the FEFP level of funding. Added costs accrue to the DRS in terms of materials, secretarial, data handling, analysis services, and other special activities which are unique to the school. The point was made by the Director that comparing the DRS costs to a public school in the District would be forced and

artificial. His reason for this was that the enterprises have different missions, and would compare Leon County salaries -- relatively low statewide -- with DRS salaries, where the strength of the school depends upon its ability to attract excellent teacher-researchers from around the state. The review team agreed in general with this line of reasoning in the case of the DRS.

4. Justification - There has been some criticism that the School is maintained only for the children of FSU faculty and government officials. The findings disprove this criticism, at least since the present admission procedures have been inaugurated. No special considerations for admission to the Developmental Research School were given individuals as a result of University affliation or government position. The selection procedure for admission to the Developmental Research School was unique. The process was computerized so that at each admission level, the selection could be based on the following criteria:

   a. Primary considerations
      1. Academic ability -- stanine and per cent desired
      2. Sex
      3. Race
      4. Socio-economic factor
   b. Secondary considerations
      1. Siblings
      2. Special talents (for special formal research or developmental projects - admitted for the length of time specified)

   In sampling the grade levels K-12 since the inauguration of the program, it was found that the composition of the class followed the pattern of percentages as established for admission with one or two exceptions. The waiting list was so arranged

that if a child moves out of the school, a child with the same qualifications could be admitted to the school program.

The overall justification presented to the teams by the DRS to retain the school's function dealt with the full commitment of the institution to the research and service mission, which contributes toward the solution of persistent problems in education. There was expressed a deep pride in the willingness and ability of those at the school to meet this commitment.

Faculty members held 9 doctorate degrees (16%), 40 masters degrees (71%) and 7 bachelor's degrees (13%); they averaged 15.5 years experience and had a mean salary of $14,316.

Due to recent criticism of the cost of the DRS being greater than a public school of equal size, the team reviewed some of the extra benefits provided. Although difficult to accurately quantify in terms of dollars, the team felt they should be considered in evaluating the overall worth of the program. The time frame was September, 1975 to April, 1976:

a. Services - 23 workshops, 56 responses to advisement requests, 16 visitations hosted, 17 consultations, 4 staff in leading positions in national educational associations, 13 other staff in educational leadership positions.

b. R & D - 23 projects in curriculum development, 8 in instructional strategies, 12 in counselor education, 4 in learning, 3 in teacher education, 9 in instrument development.

c. Pre-school nursery - 8 normal and 8 deaf pupils

d. Teacher education - 272 student observers, 117 practicum students, 151 in micro-teaching.

e. FSU professor duties - taught 27 courses.

f. Summer school - research data evaluated and processed, classwork planning normally due during school year without research and service duties, Vietnam refugee program.

Reivew Team Recommendations as Related to FSU

1. Consideration should be given to accept some children who possess physical, mental, or emotional handicaps which require special or exceptional child educational services to admission to the school.

2. The problem related to the 12-month status of the Developmental Research School staff should be resolved as early as possible (faculty at other laboratory schools have only 10-month contracts).

3. The team recommends that an analysis of the extra benefits (a-f above) provided by the school be developed and costed, if possible, and the value considered in evaluating the overall worth of the program.

4. Begin funding the DRS in general at the appropriate county FEFP level.

5. Laboratory school teachers at FSU should receive an additional stipend for the added functions which they perform.

6. The DRS should be provided with additional funds ($800.00 per teacher was suggested as a base), for services such as subsistence pay, workshops, etc.

7. Specific laboratory school projects should be appropriately funded as required.

8. Install closed circuit TV as a part of the arrangement between the Developmental Research School, and Florida State University's new Education Building, to be used for classroom observation purposes.

The review team assessed the FSU Developmental Research School as fully performing its mission as a center for educational research, conducting the types of services to the public schools which are responsive to Florida's educational needs and priorities. It also recommended a basic research allocation for educational research in the state, to be established by a State Research Policy Board.

C. University of Florida (UF)

P.K. Yonge Laboratory School

The review was conducted on April 28-30, 1976 by:

Dr. Norman Lyon - Team Leader, Lay Consultant from Palm Harbor, Florida

Mrs. Katherine LaBelle - Nova Complex at Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. Jack Tebo - Associate for Policy Analysis, Florida Department of Education

Included with those interviewed were Dr. J.B. Hodges, Director; Dr. Hellen I. Guttinger; Ms. Ruth Duncan; Dr. Sandra Damico; Dr. Cappy Longstreth; Dr. Vynce Hines; Dr. Janet Larsen; Ms. Barbara Kaiser; and 12 teachers.

P.K. Yonge enrolled 878 students in the 1975-76 school year; 239 K-3, 380 4-9, 259 10-12. Admission policies set the student population at the following: 50% male/female, 20% Black, 80% White/other.

The amount of student tuition is $22 for all grades.

Unique Role

1. Goals, missions, programs - As mentioned earlier, P.K. Yonge received national distinction in 1975 as the school which "most nearly conforms to the image of the ideal laboratory school of the future." Task priorities clearly reflected the cognizance by P.K. Yonge of the mission responsibilities described in the 1969 study for Florida laboratory schools by the State University System: "research and high risk experimentation, sharply focused in the search for solutions to persistent problems in teaching and learning." Each faculty member was viewed as a researcher as well as a teacher. In order for a teacher to initiate an R & D project, he or she must identify a need or problem -- and create a plausible solution.

2. Research - The method of performing a research project at P.K. Yonge may be simply described as follows, which points up the use of specially trained staff members:

   a. Three resource people assist in pilot testing, field testing, and dissemination.

   b. A curriculum consultant assists in stating the problem, describing treatment plans, and listing anticipated outcomes.

   c. An evaluation consultant locates suitable measurement instruments. Also, he/she assists in the field test phase in selected public schools.

   d. A curriculum consultant assists with monograph preparation, dissemination, and planning follow-up workshops and conferences.

   e. Project directors normally design a project in the summer, test in the classroom during the school year, and analyze data and prepare for field tests the following summer.

   f. After the field tests the second school year, the third summer is used to write the monographs and prepare for workshops -- to assist public school teachers and administrators use the findings and products.

Since 1970, the staff of the school produced 41 R & D projects designed less for their scholarly "discovery" value, but with an emphasis on improving classroom instruction:

Curriculum - 13
Dissemination - 2
Methodology - 14
Sociological and Psychological Factors in Learning - 10
Miscellaneous - 2

In addition, graduate students from Psychology, the Medical School, Nursing, Education and others use the facility to collect data in support of scholarly theses and dissertations.

R & D projects at P.K. Yonge have been designed to deal with the needs and problems of a typical school setting. Classroom practitioners conducted studies with the aid of research specialists, and there was evidence that faculty concerns were focused on problems in Florida public schools as well as their own classrooms. Dissemination is a 5-point process:

a. A monographic report written in practitioner language is distributed to public school personnel.

b. Curriculum materials and/or instructional guides are sent to persons whose responses have indicated interest in the monograph.

c. An invitation to state/county education leaders is dispatched inviting them to attend drive-in conferences for details of the project.

d. One- to four-day workshops are arranged in response to interest indicated in drive-in conference; these are held either at P.K. Yonge or at locations convenient to the participants.

e. Continued support services are made available as requested.

3. Relationships - The relationships between the Yonge School and other segments of the university community are seen as significant as to how the School operates. Essentially it is an autonomous division of the College of Education. Regular conferences between the School's Director and the College's Dean are not planned, and the Director meets with the Vice President for Academic Affairs on an "as needed" or "crisis"

basis. The review team concluded that a clearer understanding be developed on the campus, between the type of pragmatic R & D being accomplished at the P.K. Yonge school, as differed from scholarly or discovery research in the graduate schools of the university. Such a relationship should lead to greater mutual understandings, and be beneficial to all parties.

In contrast, the relationships between the P.K. Yonge School and the public school districts were active and intense. The 5-point dissemination process mentioned earlier addresses this, and in the "services" function these are described in greater detail.

4. Services - An example of service to the State's educational community is the P.K. Yonge Reading Model for Middle and High Schools, through a series of 30 conferences on the P.K. Yonge campus with 682 participants, and 29 workshops held in school districts with 1156 participants; the program has been established in 65 schools with an estimated 27,000 students involved during the 1975-76 school year.

Think-tank sessions with the directors from established reading labs provide feed-back necessary about problems that might arise, and to identify areas where further study may be necessary.

The Linkage Model for Resource-User Problem Solving offers a design for continuing cooperation and support involving the labs in the field, the P.K. Yonge personnel, and the College of Education participating professors.

In cooperation with teachers from other schools, research and development of materials by the Science Department has been widely disseminated. Thirty-three conferences and workshops for

a total of 670 teachers and administrators have been offered by the science staff, assisted by 30 collegues from the Florida public schools. In addition, P.K. Yonge science personnel, assisted by 22 public school personnel, have contributed to 28 conferences and workshops attended by 1,418 people.

In these and other programs where research and development efforts of P.K. Yonge faculty are accruing to the benefit of Florida public schools, teachers in the field were becoming partners with the Lab School staff in the instructional responsibilities of future workshops.

An additional area of service to the academic community was evidenced by the school's cooperation in external (other types of) research projects initiated and performed by students and faculty members of the university. During the 1975-76 school year 38 projects had been completed or were under way.

5. Teacher Education - P.K. Yonge was used in several ways to contribute to the teacher preparation program. Six hundred students a month were visiting the classrooms of the laboratory school for observation purposes. This activity was organized by the staff to ensure a practical experience for students in nursing, psychology, education and other departments. In addition, teachers from local public schools frequented the school to observe specific aspects of classroom instruction. The "participation" program included 90 students a quarter, each assigned to particular classroom teachers for pre-service education experience. The participation was designed to grow from initial to assistant to associate to intensive. Also, there were usually 10 intern students assigned to P.K. Yonge each quarter, who work under master teachers at the middle and high school levels. The entire teacher education program was clearly divided according to type of student, and extensive instructions have been developed for each visitor to learn

prior to entering the classroom. Management and administrative strength were particularly notable in this aspect of the P.K. Yonge program.

Adequacy of Budget

1. Drastic budget cut - A drastic cut in dollar resources, students, and/or teachers would change the entire mission and function of P.K. Yonge. It was clear from the three days spent at this institution that projects and activities of significance require lead times extending into three years. An inability to plan and develop these projects would bring a stop to the studies, and fertile ground for inquiring into the state's public education problem areas would have to be found elsewhere. The capability exists at P.K. Yonge, and developmental/research studies are being delivered by the staff to the school districts in many forms. President Marston recognized the work being accomplished at the school, but he believed that Commissioner Turlington must decide if what the school is delivering is worth the investment of continuing these activities.

2. Faculty status - Faculty members were highly motivated and dedicated to the P.K. Yonge mission. Their loyalty was emphasized by the administration as well as by themselves. Although their salary range was greater than Alachua County, the average teacher salary at P.K. Yonge was found to be less than paid in the county. Faculty salary has been a primary bother of the Director. He was concerned that raises will not keep pace with inflation, university salaries, and local teacher pay, and as a result there could be a massive turnover. Such a walk-out happened in the late 60's at P.K. Yonge, when 70% of the staff departed in two years, creating a vacumm which took several years to repair. Dr. J.B. Hodges, the Director, fully

understands that the successful mission accomplishment of P.K. Yonge depends upon a fully professional and experienced faculty. His efforts in the behalf of faculty pay, benefits, status, recognition, and professional progression have been notable.

At P.K. Yonge, it is clear who is doing what regarding service and research projects. The plan for 1976-77 school year lists 29 specific projects, the names of 33 staff professionals who will work on these projects, and the amount of time each is expected to spend. The organization and management of faculty functions was seen to be a motivating factor at the institution.

3. Budget - In addition to state-appropriated FEFP support funds, P.K. Yonge has developed a partial budget to support 1976-77 research and service programs. It has been summarized as follows, and does not include teacher salary increases:

Faculty salaries and fringe benefits	$158,783
Clerical salaries and fringe benefits	9,676
Personnel Services	16,000
Operating Expenses	25,000
Sound Slide Projector (Capital Outlay)	500
TOTAL	$209,959

Detail on salaries by name of recipient, operating expense by category, and personnel services by type, are available on request.

4. Justification - Admission guidelines are rigidly adhered to, and the team performed a random sampling of grades 2 and 3 which resulted in a composition consistent with the guidelines set by the school. There were no indications that the school is for the convenience of the children of university faculty members or elite residents of the county.

The team left with confidence that the pupils were receiving an excellent education under the guidance and supervision of dedicated and superior teachers and administrators. Adequate evidence was presented to show that although the teacher salary ranges at P.K. Yonge exceed those in Alachua County, the average teacher salary in the county is greater than that received at P.K. Yonge.

P.K. Yonge School offers a variety of programs (to include a summer program not mentioned earlier, which retains 32 of the staff for $45,000.00), projects, dissemination, workshops, teacher preparation, consultation, developmental research, innovative research, etc. There was no question that the school was professionally staffed, had public school support for the work performed, and was accomplishing its mission as a center for educational research in an exemplary manner. The question to be asked here is if the mission is to be retained as a needed and affordable function. The team agreed that the decision, whatever it may be, should be of a long-range nature.

Review Team Recommendations as Related to UF

1. There should be a closer articulation and working relationship between the school Director and the Dean of the College of Education, University of Florida.

2. There needs to be a clarification at the university of the difference between scholarly research and the classroom-oriented studies performed at P.K. Yonge, in order that there can be mutual understanding between initiators of both types of activity.

3. Results of research performed by graduate students who collect data from P.K. Yonge should be shared with P.K. Yonge in order that appropriate dissemination to interested educators in the field may be made.

4. A long-range decision should be made as to the continued funding of the mission being accomplished at P.K. Yonge.

D. Florida Atlantic University (FAU)

Alexander D. Henderson School at FAU

The review was conducted on May 24-26, 1976 by:

Dr. Norman Lyon - Team Leader, Lay Consultant from Palm Harbor, Florida

Mrs. Katherine LaBelle - Nova Complex, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. Jack Tebo, Associate for Policy Analysis, Florida Department of Education

Interviews were held with the following FAU and Henderson School personnel: Barbara Bittner, School Director; Nancy Cieboter, Chairman, Basic Skills II; Lorraine Harry, Chairman, Transition; Suzzanne Sturrock, Chairman, Basic Skills I; Dr. Kenneth Michels, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Louie Camp, Director of Student Teaching; Dr. Rodney Lane, Dean of Continuing Education and School Superintendent; Dr. Bill Stosberg, Assistant Dean of Education and Director of Teacher Centers; Dr. Emmy Lou Whitmer, Acting Dean of College of Education; Dr. Dorothy Laird, Head of Educational Foundations.

The Henderson School enrolled 303 pupils in the 1975-76 school year: 135 K-3, and 173 4-8.

The annual student tuition was $110 for all grades.

Pupils from the lowest economic segment of society were not well represented at this school. The isolated location of the School on the FAU campus associated with the problems of transportation and a tuition cost of $110.00 would necessarily work a particular hardship for parents of a low economic level.

The admission policy was based upon the date of application, sex, race, economic level of the parents, and a test of mental maturity. Children who were mentally retarded, physically handicapped, or emotionally disturbed were not admitted to the School because there are no special resources or facilities for these children and the children could be

better served in other schools where they have these resources and facilities.

Unique Role

1. Goals, missions, programs - As the result of the study from the State University System in 1969 on the functions of Laboratory Schools, with emphasis on "high risk" research, a committee was appointed by the Faculty Senate of FAU to investigate: the mission of the school, its structure to carry out the mission, what relationships the Henderson School should have with the University, and what unit of the University could best accept the responsibility for this relationship.

   In its report, dated April 30, 1973, the FAU Faculty Senate Committee recommended:

   1. The Henderson School should be treated in the nature of a "research grant" directly under the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President should advertise the fact that FAU was ready to accept proposals involving "high risk" research which could be carried on at the University School.
   2. A permanent committee should be formed to evaluate research proposals.
   3. Projects should be specific, as should the roles of the School faculty, duties of the administrator/director, pupil admission policies, and the staff in its relation with schools in the immediate area.
   4. If this plan, or some similar plan "is not adopted then the Committee believes the (FAU) Senate ought to consider whether the School is worth the funds and effort expended by the University in its operation."

   The unique role recommended by this Committee of the FAU Faculty Senate has never been activated because of lack of proposals, and an absence of a response to the recommendations by the Henderson School administration. The recommendations would require student and faculty replacement according to the project being conducted.

Subsequent to the visit by the review team, the Henderson School has prepared a new proposed mission statement which recommends that the school become a center for "R & D in the Gifted, Talented, and Creative Areas." The proposal is being reviewed by the Chancellor's staff, and consultants from the Division of Public Schools are providing input reactions.

2. Research - One research project was underway. It has been in progress for nearly six years. It is a longitudinal study aimed at matching pupils with teachers. This has been supervised by Dr. Rodney Lane, Dean of Continuing Education and School Superintendent. Data has not been processed, pending the employment of a research coordinator. Other kinds of research, such as that being accomplished at FSU and P.K. Yonge, was considered by Dr. Lane to be of minimal value, because it is too short in the overall application and the period of time it can be used.

The one research project was considered by the school administration to be unique and unable to be duplicated elsewhere. The review team did not agree with the inability to duplicate, and was not convinced that the project would be of value to improving instruction in the public school sector.

Researchers from the university collect data from the students enrolled, but the results of the studies were not normally shared with the school faculty or administration.

The physical plant was found to be particularly adequate to support research, and the closed circuit television arrangement provided an outstanding potential for use -- it was relatively new, extensive, and in good condition. The parents and pupils understood that they will be asked to participate in research projects, and agreed to this condition for entry. Teachers were willing to participate, but were not chosen based on experience in or a desire to participate in research. They

were selected based on teaching skills, experience, education, and other factors related to the selection of a classroom teacher.

3. Relationships - There have been no dissemination activities related to research by the Henderson School to public or private institutions. The review team interviewed representatives from the public schools in six neighboring school districts, and none was able to provide evidence of professional relationships with the Henderson School staff/faculty.

The Henderson School Director comes under the direct supervision of Dr. Lane in his role as Superintendent. Dr. Lane is also Dean of Continuing Education under Dr. Michels, Vice President for Academic Affairs. There was a noticeable lack of articulation between the Henderson School staff and the College of Education, and no formal communication arrangement was in being with the school districts, except the annual forwarding of student records to those schools who would be receiving 8th grade graduates from Henderson.

The Henderson University School is unique among the four "Laboratory Schools" supported by the State of Florida. The new building was a gift from the widow of Alexander D. Henderson, a citizen of the area, who was extremely concerned about "quality education" in the elementary schools of Florida. He founded the Hillsborough County Day School with the express purpose of meeting this objective for his own children and offspring of selected local families.

The Henderson School was built in 1968 on 25 acres at a cost of about $1.3 million, all contributed to FAU through the benefactor. A grant is provided to the school by the Henderson Foundation in the amount of about $50,000 annually to aid in the operation of the school.

4. Services - The Henderson School is not actively engaged in providing professional services to the other county schools, and school faculty are considered "teachers" with no tenure by the university. School staff was not serving on university committees. Other university members were active in bringing projects to the school, but this is not a reciprocal arrangement.

The school had a business relationship with the Palm Beach Junior College, whereby the College uses the facility for class offerings during the week from 4:00 PM to 10:00 PM and week-ends.

As a service to the College of Education at FAU, the facility was being used each summer by the college to operate a popular summer session (mini-school). 335 students usually attend for $50 apiece, and are taught by 50 unpaid student teachers under the supervision of the teacher education faculty of the college. Part of the income was being used to administer the program, and the remainder is turned over to the FAU administration.

The school itself appeared to be providing an excellent education to K-8 pupils. Classroom size was small (less than 20), there was an abundance of materials, the faculty was competent and highly motivated, the students were happy as were the parents, and there was a waiting list in excess of 1,600 youngsters. The Henderson School was providing the service that Mr. Henderson's widow had requested - an excellent school of at least six grades, with a foundation set up to aid in the operation of the school in perpetuity. The foundation funds are for those things not normally funded by the State - such as a swimming program.

Insofar as providing community services and high risk research, the school did not qualify. It was a fine educational institution and the pupils received many benefits not available to their counterparts in the local public schools. The intents of

the Henderson foundation were being met, whereas those of the Board of Regents and the University Senate were not.

5. Teacher Education - As a result of changes in the School's role and scope of purposes, and its line organization and responsibility, there was little coordination with the College of Education personnel except on an individual basis. At the time of the visit there were four student teachers assigned to the School. Use was made of the television equipment and the School's physical facilities in a Summer Student Teacher Program administered by the Student Teaching Department. Thirty to 40 students from the Centers of Discovery Program used the facilities at the Henderson School. There have been individual sharings of innovative materials, techniques, and research projects with university professors.

   At the present time the role of the Henderson School in the preparation of teachers is negligible, and this role was not seen by the staff as one with future emphasis.

   The excellent school program, however, is more than satisfying Alexander D. Henderson's concern and desire for a "quality education" for the children who attend the school.

Adequacy of Budget

1. Drastic Budget Cut - Of all of the laboratory schools, the Henderson School would probably be the least affected by a drastic budget cut. There are several reasons for this:

   a. There are no salary dollars being used for a research coordinator at ADHUS.

   b. The foundation provides about $50,000 annually.

   c. The FEFP generated $292,856 for 1976-77.

   d. Nearly $35,750 accrues annually from tuition and registration fees.

   e. The summer "mini course" program generates about $17,000 (@ $50 per pupil) annually.

f. The use of the facility by Palm Beach Junior College during the week and on week-ends represents a potential income.

g. A minimum funding to FAU for the ADHUS research and service efforts in the amount of $43,033 has been approved for the 1976-77 school year.

Despite these generations of funds, a drastic cut in dollar resources from the State University System to FAU for the support of ADHUS would have a significant affect on the school's ability to function, because interviews revealed that the university does not use all - or most - of these locally generated monies to support the Henderson School. They are put to use elsewhere in the university.

2. Faculty Status - The faculty has no special status with the university. They do not serve on university committees and have no tenure with the university.

3. Budget - For the 1976-77 school year the superintendent plans to use about $32,000 in developing a gifted, talented, and creative program that will involve programs and activities for gifted children within the regular classroom under the direction of the classroom teacher. The product of this effort is to be a handbook of gifted, talented, and creative procedures for the classroom teacher. With additional funds, the superintendent has plans for week-end gifted, talented, and creative programs, workshops, and other activities related to these special categories of students. His estimate is $6,600 per workshop, and $5,000 for development, field testing, and printing materials related to "parenting the gifted."

4. Justification - There were three reasons provided by the ADHUS administration for continuation of state support for the school.

a. The school is attended by pupils from five surrounding counties and has strong support from the parents as well as the students. It provides a quality education and does an excellent job in preparing young people for high school.

b. The research potential is great, and the plans for the new mission of designating ADHUS as a laboratory school with a major thrust in R & D pertaining to gifted, talented, and creative child education, are ready. Such designation, the superintendent reasons, will be helpful in their obtaining outside support for research and development efforts.

c. The facility represents a gift to the state and the foundation monies flow annually to FAU to support the operation of the school, but the amount is insufficient to fully operate the school. State funds are needed to keep the school open.

Review Team Recommendations as Related to FAU

1. As a center for educational research, it would appear that the school would be more appropriately situated under the Dean of the College of Education, or at least in a position for greater articulation with the College.

2. The Faculty Senate report of 1973 should be answered promptly by the Henderson School's leadership.

3. The one longitudinal study should be reviewed by the university administration for practicality, uniqueness, and worth.

4. A mechanism for sharing and disseminating results of studies conducted at the Henderson School should be developed.

5. Communication lines between the Henderson School and local public school districts and schools should be built.

6. The university should bring the Henderson School faculty into full membership with other university faculty members, to vote, serve on committees, etc.

7. With the assistance of the FAU administration, the Henderson School must develop a priority mission, get it approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents, activate the mission, and become fully operational, if the school is to be considered for future state research and service funding.

V. A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA

Each school was found different from the other three in comparative budgets; the population served or method of selection of students; amount and time of research and dissemination conducted; services performed; amount of teacher education conducted; relationships with county school systems; and use by university researchers.

Each school was similar to the other three in that the education of the students was innovative and popular with the students and parents. All four schools presented quality education programs. Each school had a waiting list. The teachers were highly motivated. The relationship of the schools to their respective Deans of the Colleges of Education varied in degree, but was seen to be generally distant; the schools were operating almost as separate entities.

The developmental research projects, which have been and are being conducted at FSU and UF, were particularly noteworthy in study effort and dissemination. These staffs were active in workships around the state and there appeared to be active coordination between the two schools and the Florida school districts.

FAU and FAMU were found to be significantly less active in research, dissemination, and service to the community.

The review teams were sensitive to the fact that each school faced the possibility of deactivation or closure or becoming a part of a local school district or becoming a university facility with a totally new function. The reviewers concluded that if the schools were to continue to operate as university laboratory schools, a missing element was a mechanism to coordinate laboratory school activities with each other, with university research activities, and with the public school system. Also, a basic judgment would have to be made as to the worth of accomplishing respective missions, i.e., if a laboratory school successfully accomplishes its mission as a center for educational research, the product must be judged in terms of the worth of the expense and effort.

CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The four campus laboratory schools should be provided the opportunity to remain open after the end of the 1976-77 school year. By mid-March, 1977, in time for the 1977 Legislative session, there should be a clear mission description developed by each university laboratory school, and this should be a joint effort between the school director, the Dean of the college under which the school is administered, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and submitted by the university president to the Board of Regents for approval. Action by the Board should take into account the role and scope of the university and the larger educational research and development efforts throughout the State. Unless a school will be a useful agency of the university to perform a specific education mission, there should be serious consideration given to discontinuation of the school by the Board of Regents.

2. The jointly-developed mission statement should include the ways in which the laboratory school will clearly address the State's priority needs in learning, instruction, and pressing public education problems. Priority areas for attention are listed on page 4 of this report.

3. Laboratory school funding should continue to be appropriated by the State Legislature. Funding for basic support should be at a level comparable to that which is provided to the public schools. The additional funds required to pay for research activities should be reviewed by the R&D Liaison Group (see main study). This body should review, coordinate, and approve program proposals, mission responsibilities, and other activities unique to each laboratory school, and coordinate efforts between all four schools as well as the appropriate agencies in the Florida public school system. Research project requests must be based upon activities, projects, and services designed to improve public elementary and secondary education in the state.

In order for this recommendation to be implemented, a time and adjustment factor would be required. The special funding for research/experimentation/service activities should be proportional to the 1976-77 research and service funds for laboratory schools. Provided that all laboratory school mission statements are approved, each school should receive for 1977-78 the same percentage of these funds as was allocated in 1976-77, except for one-third, which would be allocated based on special activity needs. In 1978-79, two-thirds may be based on special needs, and in 1979-80, all special activity funding should be based on services, experimentation, and research projects to be performed by each school.

4. Each university hosting a laboratory school should appoint a committee to establish close liaison with public school officials in order to identify public school problems or needs which require the attention of the laboratory school's efforts.

5. The procedures used to recommend that the Commissioner approve the research and service projects for laboratory schools in 1976-77, if found to be effective, may be employed as a part of the mechanism to be set up for subsequent years' funding approvals, and/or as part of an overall educational research and development coordinating mechanism.

6. Each laboratory school must make every effort to qualify for and receive Federal and other non-State grant assistance for performing research and developmental studies. Additional income not normally accruing to a public school, such as fees, personal grants, etc., should be reviewed by the instituion's liaison committee, to determine where the monies would best be used to improve a problem being experienced in the public schools.

7. Laboratory schools should be responsible for limited dissemination of their research products, to at least the university liaison committee, the local school district office, appropriate agencies in the Department of Education, and the other laboratory schools. The agency in the Department of Education most closely associated with the subject of the research product should, when warranted, be responsible for bulk or widespread dissemination of research products.

8. The education programs at each laboratory school should emphasize improved standards of quality and innovative learning activities for the students.

9. Pupil selection should be based on an objective formula which is compatible with the mission of the school; preferential acceptance of students based on family or other sources of influence should not be tolerated.

10. Other university departments should be encouraged to use the laboratory school on their respective campuses for data collection and research dealing with pressing educational problems, and the outcomes of the projects should be made available for appropriate dissemination. Such activities must be coordinated by the laboratory school staff, and it should be made clear that the students will only be used as subjects for studies related to public education needs.

11. The Board of Regents should establish a tuition plan for the four campus laboratory schools to eliminate the wide disparities in tuition charged by each school, the current range being $6.00 (FAMU) to $110.00 (FAU).